REMARKS

The Abstract stands objected to for exceeding the 150 word limit. The Abstract has been amended and is now 148 words.

Claims1-35 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11, 15-17, 22-24, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Streetman (6,456,902).

The Streetman '902 patent was filed May 16, 2000. The Applicants herein can claim a date of invention at least as early as April 12, 2000 as established by the attached declaration and exhibit. The Examiner will note, however, that the '902 patent is a continuation-in-part of an application filed November 19, 1998 which is a continuation-in-part of an application filed April 8, 1998. Both of those earlier applications matured into patents. For the Examiner's convenience, copies of those earlier filed Streetman patents are enclosed herewith. It will be appreciated that the disclosures of those earlier filed patents are relatively brief and lacking in relevant teachings as compared to the '902 patent. In particular, with regard to independent method claim 1 and independent apparatus claim 15, neither of the earlier filed patents teaches or suggests coupling a CPU located at an oil field to the worldwide web. Although the '642 patent suggests publishing data on a web site, it does not suggest directly coupling a CPU at the oil field to the web. Data is first retrieved from the oil field to a remote computer which then transmits information to an internet web site.

With regard to dependent claim 2, neither of the earlier Streetman references suggests analyzing data at a CPU located at the oil field.

Dependent claim 8 includes programming the CPU at the oil field to automatically notify one or more persons in the case of an anomaly. This is not suggested by either of the earlier Streetman references. Dependent claim 9 specifies how the person will be notified.

Dependent claim 11 specifies that the CPU at the oil field is coupled to a Web server. As mentioned above, the '642 patent teaches away from this approach by specifying that data is collected from the oil field by a remote CPU and then transmitted by the remote CPU to a web site.

The Dependent apparatus claims 16, 17, 22-24, and 26 correspond to the method claims discussed above.

Claims 4-6, 12, 18-20, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Streetman '902 in view of Ocondi. This rejection is somewhat mooted by the declaration and exhibit submitted herewith.

Claim 4 specifies that the CPU located at the oil field is programmed to determine whether the acquired data is following a trend. This is quite different from the suggestion in Ocondi that data may be remotely retrieved for subsequent trending.

Claim 5 specifies that the CPU at the oil field is programmed to determine whether a function of the acquired data falls outside programmed limits. This is neither taught nor suggested by Ocondi.

Claim 6 specifies that the CPU at the oil field is programmed to apply a correlation function to the data. This is neither taught nor suggested by Ocondi.

Dependent apparatus claims 18-20 correspond to the method claims discussed above.

Claims 8-10, 22-25, and 29-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner has pointed to antecedent basis problems in claims 8, 22, 29 and 30. These claims have been amended.

In light of all of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

David P. Gordon
Reg. No. 29,996
Attorney for Applicant(s)

GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.
65 Woods End Road
Stamford, CT 06905
voice: (203) 329-1160
fax: (203) 329-1180
email: dpg@gordonjacobson.com

April 20, 2004

Encl. Declaration of David P. Gordon with Exhibit
U.S. Patents #5,937,946 and #6,209,642